

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 – 35 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 24 and 33 are independent.

In the present response, the claims are not amended.

35 U.S.C. 103

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 9 – 15, 20 – 22 and 24 – 31 over Katabami (US 5,528,002) in view of Kable (US 4,695,680) and further in view of Makinwa (US 5,889,237).

Applicant submits that for at least the following reasons, claims 1, 2, 4, 9 – 15, 20 – 22 and 24 – 31 are patentable over Katabami, Kable and Makinwa, either singly or in combination.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

“a coil for coupling to ground along substantially the length of the user-holdable device.”

In addition, independent claim 24, in part, also requires:

“a coil for coupling to ground along substantially the length of the user-holdable device.”

In the Office Action, page 4, the Office conceded that neither Katabami nor Kable disclose that the means for coupling to ground is a coil. Because of this defect in Katabami and Kable, the Office cited Minkinwa. However, Applicant submits that Minkinwa does not cure the defect present in Katabami and Kable.

Minkinwa, Fig. 2, discloses a coil 202 for transmitting a stylus signal (column 3, line 26). In addition, Minkinwa, Fig. 3, shows that the coil 202 is capacitively coupled to the display screen 100 (column 3, lines 39 – 41). Therefore, contrary to the assertion made by the Office, the coil 202 is not for coupling to the ground. Rather, as clearly shown in Fig. 3, a terminal side 302 is used for coupling to the ground. Minkinwa does not teach or suggest that the terminal side 302 is a coil. Furthermore, Minkinwa does

not disclose a coil along substantially the length of the stylus either. Therefore, Minkwa also fails to disclose the claimed feature: a coil for coupling to ground along substantially the length of the user-holdable device.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 24 are patentable over Katabami, Kable and Makinwa, either singly or in combination.

Claims 2, 4, 9 – 15, 20 – 22 and 25 – 31 respectively depend from claims 1 and 24 and inherit all the respective features of claims 1 and 14. Thus, claims 2, 4, 9 – 15, 20 – 22 and 25 – 31 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1 and 24, with each claim containing further distinguishing features.

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Office Action rejects claims 33 – 35 over Katabami in view of Stein et al. (US 5,365,461), hereinafter Stein, and further in view of Kable and Makinwa.

Independent claim 33, in part, requires:

“providing coupling to ground by a coil extending substantially along the length of the user-held device.”

Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments for claims 1 and 24 and applies them to claim 33, pointing out why Katabami, Kable and Makinwa fail to disclose the claimed feature: providing coupling to ground by a coil extending substantially along the length of the user-held device. Furthermore, Applicant submits that Stein does not in any way cure the defects present in Katabami, Kable and Makinwa as discussed above. Therefore, claim 33 is patentable over Katabami, Kable, Makinwa and Stein, either singly or in combination. Claims 34 and 35 are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from claim 33, with each claim containing further distinguishing features.

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Office Action rejects claims 5 and 6 over Katabami in view of Kable, and further in view of Makinwa and Yamanami et al. (US 4,902,858); claims 7, 8, 19 and 32 over Katabami in view of Kable, and further in view of Makinwa and Ely et al. (US 6,667,740); claims 3, 16 and 17 over Katabami in view of Kable, and

further in view of Makinwa and Stein; claims 16 and 18 over Katabami in view of Kable, and further in view of Makinwa and Teterwak (US 5,777,898); and claim 23 over Katabami in view of Kable, and further in view of Makinwa and Colgan et al. (US 6,204,897).

Applicant submits that none of the cited secondary references can cure the defects present in Katabami, Kable and Makinwa as discussed above. Claims 3, 5 – 8, 16 – 19, 23 and 32 respectively depend from claims 1 and 24 and inherit all the respective features of claims 1 and 24. Thus, claims 3, 5 – 8, 16 – 19, 23 and 32 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1 and 24, with each claim containing further distinguishing features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Hay Yeung Cheung/
Hay Yeung Cheung
Registration No.: 56,666
Myers Wolin, LLC
(973) 401-7157

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001